

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 1 and 8 have been amended to recite that the polarizer consists essentially of a stretched hydrophilic polymer film, and new claims 48-52 have been added. Support for claims 48-52 is found in the original application, in particular page 2, lines 19-20, page 4, lines 29-30, and original claim 1, respectively.

Claims 1-18, 21-35, and 42-52 are pending in the present application. Independent claim 1, and claims 2-7, 21-22, and 48-49 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to a polarizer. Independent claim 8, and claims 9-18, 23-35, and 50-51 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to a polarizing plate. Independent claim 42, and claims 43-47 and 52 dependent thereon, are directed to a polarizer.

In the Office Action, claims 2 and 42 are objected to for an informality.

The objection is respectfully traversed. Claim 42 was corrected to recite "starting" instead of "strating" in an amendment filed on October 10, 2003. Accordingly, it is submitted that the objection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1-18, 21-35, and 42-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 6,361,838 to Miyatake et al. (Miyatake) in view of US 6,065,457 to Aminaka (Aminaka). It is alleged in the Office Action that the shrinkage property is inherently present in the film of Miyatake.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. The presently claimed invention is directed to a polarizer made with a stretched hydrophilic polymer film, as recited in present claims 1, 8, and 42, not a resin film with minute liquid crystalline regions as in Miyatake.

Namely, the polarizer of the presently claimed invention consists essentially of a stretched hydrophilic polymer film, as recited in present claims 1 and 8. It is submitted that a film with minute regions as in Miyatake is thus clearly excluded. Further, Miyatake fails to teach or suggests that the shrinkage properties of the present invention would help reduce brightness irregularities upon heating, and Aminaka fails to remedy this deficiency of Miyatake. Therefore, present claims 1 and 8, and the claims dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are not obvious over any combination of Miyatake and Aminaka.

Further, with respect to claim 42, Miyatake fails to teach or suggest conditions to improve on polarizers made of dyed and stretched hydrophilic polymer films, and Aminaka fails to remedy this deficiency of Miyatake. Therefore, the method of present claim 42 is not obvious over any combination of Miyatake and Aminaka.

In addition, with respect to new claims 48 and 50, which recite that the polarizer is formed with a dyed and stretched hydrophilic polymer film, it is submitted that Miyatake teaches away from attempting to improve on “dichroic absorption type polarizers and the like” (see Miyatake at col. 7, lines 45-46). Therefore, for this reason alone, claims 48 and 50 are not obvious over any combination of Miyatake and Aminaka.

Also, with respect to new claims 49 and 51, which recite that the polarizer is made of a stretched hydrophilic polymer film, it is submitted that Miyatake is also completely silent regarding this aspect. Therefore, for this reason alone, claims 49 and 51 are not obvious over any combination of Miyatake and Aminaka.

Finally, with respect to new claim 52, it is submitted that Miyatake is completely silent as to a film prepared by the method steps of present claim 42 and having the properties recited in

present claim 52. Therefore, for this reason alone, claim 52 is not obvious over any combination of Miyatake and Aminaka.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No. 020581

Customer No.: 38834

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

NES:rep